



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,808	09/29/2003	Ronnie Neil Patton	SLA1418	2211

7590
Gerald W. Maliszewski
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829

12/19/2007

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, LENNIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,808

Applicant(s)

PATTON ET AL.

Examiner

Lennin R. Rodriguez

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's added limitations such as "following the receipt of the imaging job, the image device determining the imaging job characteristics" requires new search and consideration and in view of this arguments are moot.
2. The objections to the claims have been withdrawn.
3. The objections to the specification have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-2, 12-13, 18-22, 29 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeHority (US 5,129,639).

(1) regarding claim 1:

DeHority '639 discloses in a print system, a method for adaptively controlling print options, the method comprising:

accepting an imaging job at an imaging device (column 2, lines 44-51);

following the receipt of the imaging job (column 2, lines 44-51), the imaging device determining the imaging job characteristics (column 3, lines 5-50, where the job characteristics are being discovered in header of the document being sent to the printer);

the imaging device determining an imaging system's capabilities (column 12, lines 30-43, where the printer by being compared to the job characteristics is an indication of determining the capabilities in order to make the matching);

the imaging device matching imaging capabilities to job characteristics (column 3, lines 51-68 and column 4, lines 1-51, where the system is performing a matching capability by capability with the obtained characteristics of the print job); and,

performing the imaging job on an imaging device (column 2, lines 64-66).

(2) regarding claim 20:

DeHority '639 further discloses an imaging device system for adaptively controlling print options, the system comprising:

a controller embedded with an imaging device (20 in Fig. 1) having an interface to accept an imaging job, following the receipt of the imaging job (network interface 18 in Fig. 1), the controller (20 in Fig. 1) determining imaging job characteristics (column 3, lines 5-50, where the job characteristics are being discovered in header of the document being sent to the printer) and supplying selected capabilities at an interface in response to matching determined job characteristics to system capabilities (column 3, lines 51-68 and column 4, lines 1-51, where the system is performing a matching capability by capability with the obtained characteristics of the print job); and

an imaging device output unit (printer 16 in Fig. 1) having an interface to accept the imaging job and selected capabilities (network interface 18 in Fig. 1) and to supply a job output responsive to the selected capabilities (column 2, lines 64-66, where the output job is being supply with regards to the best-fit analysis being held before sending the job to the printer).

(3) regarding claims 2 and 21:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein determining the imaging job characteristics includes determining job characteristics selected from a group including optimal print media (column 3, lines 5-50, where the optimal size, color, etc. of the paper is being determined by the printer), ink chemistry, and image processing.

(4) regarding claims 12 and 37:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein performing the imaging job on an imaging device includes performing the imaging job on an imaging device selected from a group including a printer (printer 16 in Fig. 1), copier, fax, scanner, and multifunctional peripheral (MFP).

(5) regarding claim 13:

DeHority '639 further discloses automatically selecting the imaging device capabilities in response to matching of system capabilities to job characteristics (column 3, lines 51-68 and column 4, lines 1-51, where the system is performing a matching capability by capability with the obtained characteristics of the print job); and

wherein performing the imaging job on an imaging device includes performing the imaging job in response to the automatic selection of imaging system capabilities (column 2, lines 64-66).

(6) regarding claim 18:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein accepting an imaging job includes accepting an imaging job selected from a group including an electronic file (column 2, lines 44-51, where as it is well know print data sent through a network is in electronic form) and a hardcopy.

(7) regarding claim 19:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein performing the imaging job on an imaging device includes performing a job selected from a group including printing (column 2, lines 64-66) and scanning.

(8) regarding claim 22:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein the controller determines capabilities selected from a group including available print media (column 3, lines 5-50, where the paper type available is one of the capabilities to be matched by the printer), available inks, available image processes, and imaging device hardware.

(9) regarding claim 29:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein determining available print media includes determining media characteristics selected from a group including media type (column 3, lines 5-50, where the paper type available is one of the capabilities to be

matched by the printer), media weight, media brightness, tray number, and media name.

(10) regarding claim 38:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein the controller automatically selects the imaging device capabilities in response to the matching of system capabilities to job characteristics (column 3, lines 51-68 and column 4, lines 1-51, where the system is performing a matching capability by capability with the obtained characteristics of the print job).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 3-6, 9-11, 16-17, 22, 26, 32-33, 36 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHority (US 5,129,639) in view of Wadley (US 2002/0181014).

(1) regarding claim 3:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining available print media (column 3, lines 5-50, where the paper type available is one of the capabilities to be matched by the printer), available image processes (column 2, lines 50-54, where one the output devices' capabilities is image processing), and imaging device firmware (column 2, lines 67-68).

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining available inks.

However, Wadley '014 teaches wherein determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining available inks (paragraph [0027], lines 1-5, where the available ink is determined).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made where determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining available inks as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(2) regarding claim 4:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein determining available print media includes an action selected from a group including enacting a user interface dialog with a user, reading print media identification of paper loaded in an imaging device, and accessing a memory of stored media data.

However, Wadley '014 teaches wherein determining available print media includes an action selected from a group including enacting a user interface dialog with a user (paragraph [0028], lines 1-4, where there is a user interface enacted to the user), reading print media identification of paper loaded in an imaging device, and accessing a memory of stored media data.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that available print media includes an action selected from a

group including enacting a user interface dialog with a user, reading print media identification of paper loaded in an imaging device, and accessing a memory of stored media data as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(3) regarding claim 5:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein enacting a user interface dialog includes accessing the dialog from a node selected from a group including an imaging device front panel, a web page associated with an imaging device, and a client connected to an imaging device.

However, Wadley '014 teaches wherein enacting a user interface dialog includes accessing the dialog from a node selected from a group including an imaging device front panel (paragraph [0028], lines 1-4, where the user interface being show to the user is in a display panel in the printer), a web page associated with an imaging device, and a client connected to an imaging device.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enact a user interface dialog that includes accessing the dialog from a node selected from a group including an imaging device front panel, a web page associated with an imaging device, and a client connected to an imaging device as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(4) regarding claim 6:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein determining available print media includes determining media characteristics selected from a group including media type (column 3, lines 5-50, where the paper type available is one of the capabilities to be matched by the printer), media weight, media brightness, tray number, and media name.

(5) regarding claim 9:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein determining the imaging job characteristics includes determining the imaging job characteristics in response to an action selected from a group including examining a print driver print stream to determine the file type, enacting a user interface dialog with the user, receiving pre-determined imaging job characteristics from a device driver embedded in a PRN image file, and receiving pre-determined imaging job characteristics from a device driver embedded in a job stream.

However, Wadley '014 teaches wherein determining the imaging job characteristics includes determining the imaging job characteristics in response to an action selected from a group including examining a print driver print stream to determine the file type (paragraph [0039], where the context-analyzer determines what type of file is being printed), enacting a user interface dialog with the user, receiving pre-determined imaging job characteristics from a device driver embedded in a PRN image file, and receiving pre-determined imaging job characteristics from a device driver embedded in a job stream.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein determining the imaging job characteristics includes determining the imaging job characteristics in response to an action selected from a group including examining a print driver print stream to determine the file type, enacting a user interface dialog with the user, receiving pre-determined imaging job characteristics from a device driver embedded in a PRN image file, and receiving pre-determined imaging job characteristics from a device driver embedded in a job stream as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(6) regarding claim 10:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein enacting a user interface dialog with a user includes accessing the dialog from a node selected from a group including an imaging device front panel, a web page associated with an imaging device, and a client connected to an imaging device.

However, Wadley '014 teaches wherein enacting a user interface dialog with a user (paragraph [0028]) includes accessing the dialog from a node selected from a group including an imaging device front panel (134 in Fig. 2), a web page associated with an imaging device, and a client connected to an imaging device.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein enacting a user interface dialog with a user includes accessing the dialog from a node selected from a group including an imaging device

front panel, a web page associated with an imaging device, and a client connected to an imaging device as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(7) regarding claims 11 and 36:

DeHority '639 further discloses wherein determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining the capabilities of an imaging device (column 12, lines 30-43, where the printer by being compare to the job characteristics is an indication of determining the capabilities in order to make the matching);

wherein matching imaging system capabilities to job characteristics includes matching the capabilities of an imaging device to the job characteristics (column 3, lines 51-68 and column 4, lines 1-51, where the system is performing a matching capability by capability with the obtained characteristics of the print job); and,

wherein performing the job on an imaging device includes performing the job of the imaging device whose capabilities best match the job characteristics (column 2, lines 64-66).

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except having a plurality of network-connected imaging devices.

However, Wadley '014 teaches having a plurality of network-connected imaging devices (Fig. 1 and paragraph [0022]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having a plurality of network-connected imaging devices as

taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(8) regarding claim 16:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except presenting a user with a user interface dialog for a selection of a means for determining the imaging system capabilities; and,

wherein determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining capabilities in response to the selection means dialog.

However, Wadley '014 teaches presenting a user with a user interface dialog for a selection of a means for determining the imaging system capabilities (paragraph [0028], where the user is presented with options of the printer); and,

wherein determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining capabilities in response to the selection means dialog (paragraph [0028], where then user selects from the options available).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made presenting a user with a user interface dialog for the selection of a means for determining the imaging system capabilities and, wherein determining an imaging system's capabilities includes determining capabilities in response to the selection means dialog as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(9) regarding claim 17:

DeHority '639 further discloses in response to matching of imaging system capabilities to job characteristics (column 3, lines 51-68 and column 4, lines 1-51, where the system is performing a matching capability by capability with the obtained characteristics of the print job), presenting the match findings on a user interface to a user (column 3, lines 20-26);

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except supplying a user interface dialog for a manual selection of imaging system capabilities; and,

wherein performing the imaging job on an imaging device includes performing the imaging job in response to the manual selection of imaging system capabilities.

However, Wadley '014 teaches supplying a user interface dialog for a manual selection of imaging system capabilities (paragraph [0028], where the user is presented with options of the printer); and,

wherein performing the imaging job on an imaging device includes performing the imaging job in response to the manual selection of imaging system capabilities (paragraph [0028], where then user selects from the options available).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made supplying a user interface dialog for a manual selection of imaging system capabilities and, wherein performing the imaging job on an imaging device includes performing the imaging job in response to the manual selection of imaging system capabilities as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639.

With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(10) regarding claims 23 and 32:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except a user interface (UI) connected to the controller; and

wherein the controller determines available print media in response to enacting a user interface dialog with a user.

However, Wadley '014 teaches a user interface (UI) connected to the controller (Fig. 2); and

wherein the controller determines available print media in response to enacting a user interface dialog with a user (paragraph [0027], lines 1-5, where the print media type is determined, e.g. paper, plastic, etc. and paragraph [0028], lines 1-4, where the user has the option to select in the display panel).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a user interface (UI) connected to the controller and wherein the controller determines available print media in response to enacting a user interface dialog with a user as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(11) regarding claims 26 and 33:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the user interface resides at a front panel of the imaging device.

However, Wadley '014 teaches wherein the user interface resides at a front panel of the imaging device (paragraph [0028], lines 1-4, where the user interface being show to the user is in a display panel in the printer).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the user interface resides at a front panel of the imaging device as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

(12) regarding claims 41 and 42:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except a user interface (UI) having an interface to the controller; and,

wherein the controller presents a user interface dialog for the selection of a means for determining the imaging system capabilities via the UI.

However, Wadley '014 teaches a user interface (UI) having an interface to the controller (Fig. 2); and,

wherein the controller presents a user interface dialog for the selection of a means for determining the imaging system capabilities (paragraph [0027], lines 1-5, where the print media type is determined, e.g. paper, plastic, etc. and paragraph [0028], lines 1-4, where the user has the option to select in the display panel), via the UI.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a user interface (UI) having an interface to the controller and, wherein the controller presents a user interface dialog for the selection of

a means for determining the imaging system capabilities via the UI as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

8. Claims 7 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHority (US 5,129,639) and Wadley (US 2002/0181014) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Wiechers (US 2002/0075509).

DeHority '639 and Wadley '014 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein determining available image processes includes determining an imaging device's resolution capabilities.

However, Wiechers '509 teaches wherein determining available image processes includes determining an imaging device's resolution capabilities (paragraph [0017]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein determining available image processes includes determining an imaging device's resolution capabilities as taught by Wiechers '509, in the system of DeHority '639 and Wadley '014. In terms of network user parameters, the network addressable device then determines whether the printer candidate sufficiently satisfies user parameters including cost and time expectations (paragraph [0009], lines 5-8).

9. Claims 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHority (US 5,129,639) and Wadley (US 2002/0181014) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Neuhard et al. (US 6,052,198).

DeHority '639 and Wadley '014 disclose all the subject matter as described above except storing the available print media information; and,

determining the available print media for subsequent imaging jobs in response to accessing the stored print media information.

However, Neuhard '198 teaches storing the available print media information (column 6, lines 62-67 and column 7, line 1, where print attribute information is being interpreted as containing print media information); and,

determining the available print media for subsequent imaging jobs in response to accessing the stored print media information (column 6, lines 62-67 and column 7, lines 1-8, when the printer driver program process the print attribute information, it recognizes the value, meaning that it would recognize the available media from the store information).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the available print media information and, determine the available print media for subsequent imaging jobs in response to accessing the stored print media information as taught by Neuhard '198, in the system of DeHority '639 and Wadley '014. Thus when the print driver needs to process the information, the value could be easily recognize (column 7, lines 5-8), by doing this, the system becomes more efficient.

10. Claims 14-15 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHority (US 5,129,639) in view of Wiechers (US 2002/0075509).

(1) regarding claims 14 and 39:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except establishing minimal match criteria; and,

following the matching of system capabilities to job characteristics, supplying a warning in response to detecting a match below the minimal match criteria.

However, Wiechers '509 teaches establishing minimal match criteria (paragraph [0025], lines 10-14, where the fact that the printer candidates need to meet or most nearly meet the user's parameters is clear evidence of a minimal match criteria); and,

following the matching of system capabilities to job characteristics, supplying a warning in response to detecting a match below the minimal match criteria (paragraph [0032], lines 1-4, where the user is made aware of the inability of the printing device to perform the job following the math criteria).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to establish minimal match criteria and, following the matching of system capabilities to job characteristics, supplying a warning in response to detecting a match below the minimal match criteria as taught by Wiechers '509, in the system of DeHority '639. In terms of network user parameters, the network addressable device then determines whether the printer candidate sufficiently satisfies user parameters including cost and time expectations (paragraph [0009], lines 5-8).

(2) regarding claims 15 and 40:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except presenting a user with a user interface dialog for the selection of alternate imaging system capabilities in response to the warning.

However, Wiechers '509 teaches presenting a user with a user interface dialog for the selection of alternate imaging system capabilities in response to the warning (paragraph [0032], where the user can choose not to wait for an alternate printer being presented to him in order to substitute the printer that does not have certain capabilities).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to present a user with a user interface dialog for the selection of alternate imaging system capabilities in response to the warning as taught by Wiechers '509, in the system of DeHority '639. In terms of network user parameters, the network addressable device then determines whether the printer candidate sufficiently satisfies user parameters including cost and time expectations (paragraph [0009], lines 5-8).

11. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHority (US 5,129,639) view of Walker et al. (US Patent 6,561,643).

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except a reader having an interface for accepting print media and for supplying decoded print media identification to the controller; and,

wherein the controller determines available print media to response to accepting the decoded print media identification from the reader.

However, Walker '643 teaches a reader having an interface for accepting print media and for supplying decoded print media identification to the controller (column 42, lines 60-67 and column 43, lines 1-2, where the media sensor is being interpreted as the reader); and,

wherein the controller determines available print media to response to accepting the decoded print media identification from the reader (column 5, lines 46-48, where information about available media is being supplied to the user).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a reader having an interface for accepting print media and for supplying decoded print media identification to the controller and, wherein the controller determines available print media to response to accepting the decoded print media identification from the reader as taught by Walker '643, in the system of DeHority '639. Thus, it would be desirable to provide an optical sensing system for determining information about the type of media entering the printing mechanism, so the printing mechanism can automatically adjust printing for optimal images without requiring user intervention (column 6, lines 19-23).

12. Claims 27, 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHority (US 5,129,639) and Wadley (US 2002/0181014) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Ferlitsch (US 6,943,905).

(1) regarding claims 27 and 34:

DeHority '639 and Wadley '014 disclose all the subject matter as described above except a client, with a print driver, having an interface for sending imaging jobs to the print driver; and,

wherein the UI resides with the client.

However, Ferlitsch '905 teaches a client (column 8, lines 21-23), with a print driver (column 8, lines 25-28), having an interface for sending imaging jobs to the print

driver (column 8, lines 21-28, since they are connected they have an interface to send the jobs); and,

wherein the UI resides with the client (column 8, lines 63-66, where the dialog is accessible from a client computing device).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a client, with a print driver, having an interface for sending imaging jobs to the print driver and, wherein the UI resides with the client as taught by Ferlitsch '905 in the system of DeHority '639 and Wadley '014. With this a user of a client computer connected to the printer has access to the information about the imaging device status.

(2) regarding claim 31:

DeHority '639 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the controller determines a file type in response to examining the print driver print stream from the client.

However, Wadley '014 teaches wherein the controller determines a file type in response to examining the print driver print stream from the client (paragraph [0039], where the context-analyzer determines what type of file is being printed).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the controller determines a file type in response to examining the print driver print stream from the client as taught by Wadley '014, in the system of DeHority '639. With this, it is provided a way for an organization to monitor

the content of documents being printed on organization printer resources (paragraph [0009], lines 1-4).

13. Claims 28 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeHority (US 5,129,639) and Wadley (US 2002/0181014) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Hayward et al. (US 7,031,004).

DeHority '639 and Wadley '014 disclose all the subject matter as described above except a web page having an interface connected to controller, for sending available print media information in response to a UI dialog; and,

wherein the UI has a connection to the web page.

However, Hayward '004 a web page having an interface connected to controller (column 5, lines 29-34, where Kinko's web page is the web page), for sending available print media information in response to a UI dialog (column 5, lines 39-40, where paper type and size is being interpreted as print media information); and,

wherein the UI has a connection to the web page (column 5, lines 29-34, where Kinko's web page has an order form displayed in a UI).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a web page having an interface connected to controller, for sending available print media information in response to a UI dialog; and, wherein the UI has a connection to the web page as taught by Hayward '004, in the system of DeHority '639 and Wadley '014. With this, it allows a user to be within any application (e.g., MS Word.TM., MS Excel.TM., Adobe PhotoShop.TM.etc.) and send a print job to

a service bureau with the same robustness and top level options as one would expect from a local or direct-networked printer (column 2, lines 40-44).

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lennin R. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (571) 270-1678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30am - 6:00pm EST.

Application/Control Number:
10/673,808
Art Unit: 2625

Page 24

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lennin Rodriguez
12/16/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'KYP', with a stylized flourish at the end.

KING Y. POON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER